DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 706 HE 012 172

AUTHOR Bogue, E. Grady; Troutt, William E.
TITLE Bridging the Gap Between Public Accountability and Faculty Autonomy: A Campus-Based Approach in Developing Effectiveness Indicators.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented to the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting (Toronto, Ontario, 1978); for related documents, see HE 012 174-175

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Educational Assessment; *Educational Finance; Educational Objectives; Evaluation Criteria; *Higher Education; Institutional Evaluation; *Performance Criteria; Pilot Projects; Program Descriptions; *Resource Allocations; School Funds; State Agencies; *State Aid; State Colleges; State Standards; Tax Support
IDENTIFIERS Columbia State Community College TN; *Formula Funding; *Tennessee Higher Education Commission; University of Tennessee Knoxville; University of Tennessee Martin; University of Tennessee Nashville

ABSTRACT

The Performance Funding Project of the Tennessee Higher Education Commission to improve the current appropriations formula in Tennessee is discussed, and abstracts regarding pilot implementation of the project at four institutions are presented. The major project objective is to explore the feasibility of allocating some portion of state funds on a performance criterion, as compared to allocating funds solely on an enrollment criterion. It is assumed that funding will continue to be primarily based on enrollment, but that a complementary feature might be built into the formula to promote institutional diversity and improved instructional performance. During the first project year, faculties at 11 Tennessee institutions developed institutional-wide instructional goals and associated indicators for measuring performance on those goals. The second project year involved collecting data on the indicators and exploring ways in which project results might be incorporated into the allocation process. Indicator profiles are included for the following four colleges: Columbia State Community College, The University of Tennessee at Knoxville, The University of Tennessee at Martin, and The University of Tennessee at Nashville. Observations based on the pilot projects are presented. An "Evaluation Network Newsletter" article on evaluation in higher education at the departmental and program level is appended. (SW)

BRIDGING THE GAP BETWEEN PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY AND FACULTY AUTONOMY: A CAMPUS-BASED APPROACH IN DEVELOPING EFFECTIVENESS INDICATORS

A PAPER PRESENTED

TO THE

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

1978

ANNUAL MEETING

TORONTO, ONTARIO

by

E. GRADY BOGUE, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

WILLIAM E. TROUTT, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, PERFORMANCE FUNDING PROJECT

TENNESSEE HIGHER EDUCATION COMMISSION

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

When one goes for a physical examination, the physician doesn't check "health." The physician instead monitors a series of physiological indicators collectively allowing some assessment of our state of health. Likewise the "state of health" of a social unit may be found in epidemiological data on mortality, morbidity, disability, etc.

What is the promise of a profile of educational indicators in presenting a picture of the condition of higher education? Good conceptual work exists from several sources. Publications of the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) provide interesting displays of educational indicators.[1] Recent work of the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) also makes a valuable contribution.[2] Classification approaches, such as that suggested by Gooler, are also useful.[3]

The acceptability of this work at the campus level, however, remains a question mark. Many campus observers are uneasy about the potential development of educational performance indicators, especially at the state level, viewing this as a continuation of a "leveling" (or "meddling") influence that began with statewide funding formulae for public institutions.

This report profiles a statewide partnership effort in the development of performance indicators in higher education. It is a report of eleven Tennessee public institutions--universities and community colleges--working to identify performance indicators reflecting their institutional mission, to acquire data on those indicators, to make public the results, and to act on those results for the improvement of instruction.

This paper centers on performance indicators, but it builds on a larger effort known as the Performance Funding Project. The Performance Funding Project represents an attempt by the Tennessee Higher Education Commission to improve the current appropriations formula in Tennessee. The project assumes state funding will continue to rest primarily on an enrollment basis, but that a complementary feature might be built into the formula to promote instructional affectiveness. Campus-based pilot projects provide the vehicle for exploring this possibility. The Commission initiated these projects through a call for proposals and provided support through grants from the Kellogg Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education. Last year, faculties at eleven Tennessee institutions developed institutional-wide instructional goals and associated indicators for measuring performance on those goals. Pilot project activity this year involves collecting data on those indicators and exploring ways in which project results might be incorporated into the allocation process.

Case Illustrations - Diversity Within Community

Attachment A includes abstracts of the indicator profiles for four institutions: Columbia State Community College, The University of Tennessee at Knoxville, The University of Tennessee at Martin, and The University of Tennessee at Nashville. These abstracts illustrate the kind of work completed at all eleven institutions at the end of the first project year. These abstracts are taken from larger reports available from each participating institutions. Even a review a limited number of project abstracts, however, provides some interesting observations.

First of all, the profiles presented in Appendix A, reveal that many projects take advantage of good work already completed, a pleasant recognition of the conceptual work completed by such agencies as NCHEMS, ETS, and ACT. The array of campus indicators includes a distribution of readily-available instruments and indicators and those developed at the campus level. Thus, campus projects for the most part avoid "reinventing the indicator wheel."

Second, these goal and indicator profiles clearly express institutional diversity. While many institutional goals have a common character, the indicators chosen represent differences in institutional choice as to what measures best represent an institution's public performance on those goals.

Third, the selection of indicators reveals the willingness of campuses to risk. Note should be taken of planned participation in at least two experimental ventures -- the College Outcome Measures Project being developed at ACT and the General Education Outcome Project being developed by ETS.

Finally, the project presents the possibility of bridging the gap between public accountability and institutional/faculty autonomy. While institutional faculties grow uneasy with the increasing interest of external agencies in campus affairs, public interest in higher education accountability continues undiminished. The goals and indicators developed by the various pilot projects clearly demonstrate that institutions can satisfy public accountability concerns and simultaneously express their unique character.

Evaluation — A Modest Stimulus With A Big Response

Other conclusions emerge from an analysis of these indicator profiles and the work leading to their development. The following outline suggests several "lessons learned" and "Promising findings."

Lesson #1. Most campuses identified a relatively large number of indicators. Realizing that any single indicator can be criticized as an inadequate reflection of instructional performance, pilot projects attempt to assess performance by focusing several indicators on the same goal. In some cases, however, the burden of evaluation created by a large number of indicators suggests limiting work to a few well-chosen indicators.

Lesson #2. Campus personnel are concerned institutions with an apparent richness of conceptual expertise might fair better — the idea that the "big" campus already rich in resources will win out over the "smaller" campus in any performance competition. The performance record of the pilot projects thus far is encouraging us however since community college appear to be developing some our best projects..

Lesson #3. The possibility of statewide indicators of institutional performance is disturbing to campus personnel. Early in the project the possibility of developing a set of statewide indicators that all institutions could be assessed against was discussed. One campus administrator pointed out, though, that statewide indicators of performance "average out" institutional identity just as the current formula supposedly does, since every institution would be assessed by a common standard.

Lesson #4. While campuses are reluctant to consider statewide performance indicators, they are equally suspicious of campus-based indicators. This suspicion grows partly out of a concern that campus-developed indicators will not be equally rigorous across institutions. One faculty committee working on the Performance Funding Project asked why they should develop rigorous instructional goals when another institution might select a "straw-man" approach to goal setting and be rewarded more for less achievement. Suspicion also grows out of a concern that one department or college be singled out as solely responsible for certain instructional goals or outcomes, e.g., English department for communication competencies, philosophy department for critical thinking competencies.

Lesson #5. Getting faculty to think in terms of institutional-wide goals and indicators is difficult. Individuals speak with ease about departmental goals and indicators but arriving at goals and indicators that cut across departmental lines is another matter.

Lesson #6. Our desire for institutional-wide instructional performance measures is running a little in advance of the technical capability of the assessment community. Several developmental efforts, however, by the American College Testing Program and the Educational Testing Service look promising.

Promising Findings

Coupled with some difficult and sometimes painful lessons learned during the past year have been some promising and encouraging findings.

Promising Finding #1. Faculties across Tennessee are very concerned about instructional performance. They sense that funding solely in terms of number of students served encourages prostitution of academic standards.

Promising Finding #2. Addressing the question of what constitutes effective instructional performance has led to a serious consideration of what constitutes minimum competence for a college degree. This became the focal point of a statewide forum, sponsored by the Ford Foundation, on minimal, essential skills and understandings that all college students ought to possess.

Promising Finding #3. The Performance Funding Project is causing hundreds of faculty members and administrators to take a serious look at the effect they are having on students.

Promising Finding #4. A number of solutions have been found to questions that plagued the project in its initial stages. For instance, how can you have equal rigor in the assessment of achievement of goals when goals and performance indicators differ from campus to campus? One possibility would be to have a board of visitors provide an assessment of each institution's performance against its set of individually developed instructional goals. This assessment could, in turn, be translated into a factor to be used in allocating some portion of the state allocation.

Promising Finding #5. Initial impressions suggested that a classification scheme or model framework of indicator development might emerge from the work of pilot projects. It was hoped that the indicators developed by eleven

campus pilot projects might neatly fall into a framework based on types of institutions and programs, types of students served, and types of institutional goals. Pilot project results do not appear, however, to lend themselves to any sort of discreet classification. For example, indicators for assessing student achievement at two community college more closely resemble those developed by two regional universities than the indicators of the third community college.

Upon reflection, however, this finding only underscores a very pleasi... outcome of this project--that public colleges and universities can express their diversity in very meaningful ways.

In conclusion, as a research effort for the development of higher education performance measures, our project does not appear to be very impressive. Out of all the indicators developed or identified by pilot projects, only a small number differ from those offered in a 1974 NCHEMS Outcomes Measures Identification Study.[4] The significance of the Performance Funding Project lies in its discovery that faculty are willing to identify and develop public expressions of instructional effectiveness that reflect the uniqueness of their institutions. The task ahead for the Performance Funding Project is to implement a funding policy that will promote that activity.

References

[1]National Center for Education Statistics, The Condition of Education (Washington: GPO, 1975).

[2]Oscar T. Lenning, et. al., A Structure for the Outcomes of Postsecondary Education (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1977).

[3]Dennis D. Gooler, "The Development and Use of Educational Indicators," in Educational Indicators: Monitoring the State of Education (Princeton, N.J.: ETS, 1975).

[4]Sidney S. Micek and William R. Arney, The Higher Education Outcome Measures Identification Study (Boulder, Colorado: NCHEMS, 1974).

ATTACHMENT A

SELECTED INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES OF

PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

SURVEY OF PERFORMANCE FUNDING PROJECT

AT

COLUMBIA STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE: Dr. Harold S. Pryor

DIRECTOR OF THE PROJECT: Dr. William A. Tallon

DESCRIPTION OF THE COLLEGE:

Columbia State Community College, established in 1966, was Tennessee's first community college. The college is located in Columbia, Tennessee, a city of 30,000, about forty miles south of Nashville. The college enrolls approximately 2,000 full-time equivalent students.

Columbia State offers two areas of University parallel courses in a wide variety of areas to prepare students for work on the senior college level. It also offers a number of programs of technological and preprofessional work for those students preparing to enter industry, business, and the professions in a two or three year period. The college also offers a program of continuing education for either credit or noncredit.

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

GOALS	ASSOCIATED INDICATORS
(1) To prepare students for advanced academic work at a four year or professional school.	Percent of qualified students who transfer as measured by institutional records. Percent of transfer students receiving degree as measured by receiving school's records. Student GPA at Columbia State and at receiving institution from institutional records. Student responses to survey questions. Number of credit course offerings that are college parallel. (3)
(2) To prepare students for specific occupational careers in two years of academic work.	Length of time for Career Education majors to receive a degree. Number of graduates passing licensing exam on the first try as reported by licensing agencies. Graduates responses to survey questions concerning satisfaction with preparation, time till first job, whether working in their field, and salary earned. Employer responses to survey. Number of majors offered. Number of majors certified.

GOALS	ASSOCIATED INDICATORS
(3) To provide opportunities for continuing education in the service area.	Number of evening and off-campus courses offered. Number of workshops and seminars sponsored by CSCC. Number of requests from local businesses for special courses or workshops. Number of continuing education units granted each year. Student satisfaction with courses or workshops as measured by surveys.
(4) To provide remedial instruction for students who are not academically prepared for college level courses.	Student success in credit courses related to the developmental course. Student satisfaction with developmental courses. Student test score gains after taking a developmental course. Final GPA of those who take developmental courses compared to those who do not.
(5) To assist students in acquiring basic learning and study skills.	Number of students increasing standard test scores after completing the program. Number of students remaining in school after completing the program. GPA of students in the program compared to those not in the program. Student satisfaction and increase in self-confidence after completing the program.

GOALS	ASSOCIATED INDICATORS
(6) To provide academic and vocational counseling for students.	Number of students advised to take developmental courses and the number who do. Number of students advised to take study skills program and the number who do. Number of students developing realistic career and educational goals while at Columbia State. Student satisfaction with advising program.
(7) To increase the depth and breadth of knowledge for those students receiving an Associates Degree.	Scores of graduates on National Assessment of Educational Progress test materials. Scores of graduates on ACT test compared to their entering scores. Scores of graduates on local math test, writing sample and Nelson-Denny reading test compared to their entering scores.
(8) To offer a wide range of special activities intended to increase the general cultural level of the service area.	Number and type of programs sponsored by Columbia State for the community. Attendance at special programs. Number of faculty giving talks off campus. Number of groups using Columbia State facilities.

SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE FUNDING PROJECT

AT

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, KNOXVILLE

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Jack E. Reese

DIRECTOR OF THE PROJECT: Dr. Fred N. Peebles

DESCRIPTION OF THE UNIVERSITY:

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville is the "capstone" campus of The University of Tennessee, a multi-campus, multi-purpose system of higher education encompassing all Tennessee. The University of Tennessee is both the State University and the official Land-Grant Institution of Tennessee. UTK seeks to develop human and material resources of Tennessee through public service. In the fall of 1976 a total of 29,711 students were enrolled at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. To serve the academic needs of these students, UTK offers 111 degree programs at the bachelor's level, 123 at the master's level, and 52 at the doctoral level.

ABSTRACT

The UTK Performance Funding Project is being carried out in the UTK College of Engineering and is intended to be a pilot effort for the Knoxville Campus. Upon completion of the college-level study the methodology and approach to assessment of engineering education effectiveness will be utilized in the assessment of effectiveness in other professional disciplines of UTK.

The UTK College of Engineering Performance Funding Project will assess the effectiveness of engineering education offered in the college through measurements of three performance variables:

(1) engineering graduates' knowledge of the mathematics, basic sciences, and engineering sciences,

(2) expected professional characteristics of UTK engineering graduates (See Exhibit A) and

(3) progress toward achievement of College of Engineering Decade Goals-An Emphasis on Engineering Excellence. (See Exhibit B).

The graduates' knowledge of mathematics, basic science, and engineering sciences will be measured through performance of engineering seniors on the national Engineer-In-Training (E.I.T.) examination. Scores on the EIT examination for 200 to 300 seniors per year will be compared with national norms, and engineering education effectiveness will be indicated positive as UTK graduates' scores exceed the national norms. Assessment of the expected professional characteristics of UTK engineering graduates will be done through responses to a new survey questionnaire by

(a) self-analysis of 500 to 1000 graduates awarded UTK baccalaureate degrees during the past ten years

(b) by supervisors of the same 500 to 1000 graduates who provide the self analysis responses, and

(c) by UTK engineering faculty for the 600 to 800 graduates awarded B. S. degrees during 1976-77 and 1977-78.

Assessment of progress toward achievement of the College of Engineering Decade Goals will be made through presentation of reports on performance to a Board of Visitors comprising engineering and educational leaders from industry, government, and private practice.

Table I provides a tabular display of the performance variables, the performance indicators, and the populations being evaluated for the UTK College of Engineering Performance Funding Project.

EXHIBIT A

EXPECTED PROFESSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF
UTK ENGINEERING GRADUATES

- o Factual Knowledge, a strong background in mathematics and an understanding in some depth of one or more areas of applied science;

- o Ability to Define and Solve Problems, an orderly set of thought processes for identifying and solving unfamiliar problems, including the ability to decide upon the information needed to solve a given problem, the ability to obtain that information from available sources, and the ability to define feasible methods for developing this information if otherwise unavailable;

- o Ability to Analyze Systems, Processes, Machines, or Devices, commonly utilized in the graduate's field of engineering practice;

- o Ability to Apply Fundamental Elements of the Design Process, (establishment of objectives and criteria, synthesis, analysis, construction, testing, and evaluation) in devising a system, component, or process to meet desired needs;

- o Ability to Communicate, the ability to communicate clearly with others orally and in writing;

- o Motivation to Continue Professional Development as a Life-long Process, through independent study, organized continuing education programs, or part-time study toward an advanced degree;

- o Professional and Social Responsibility, an appreciation of the interaction between technology and society as a whole, and a sense of responsibility for assuring that this interaction is harmonious; and

- o Knowledge of and Ability to Apply the Code of Ethics of Engineers in Professional Practice.

COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING GOALS FOR THE NEXT DECADE: AN EMPHASIS ON EXCELLENCE

1. Achieve national recognition for excellence of all engineering programs. The measures of this achievement include: the development of a superior climate of learning appropriate for a professional school of engineering; the development of a faculty and student body of the highest caliber consistent with meeting the educational requirements of the state; the achievement of a uniformly high morale among the faculty and students; and nationally recognized engineering accomplishments of a quality which is professionally and intellectually satisfying to both faculty and students.

2. Develop and maintain teaching excellence as indicated by the learning accomplishments of students and by such faculty characteristics as being well-prepared for all classes, being genuinely concerned for and able to communicate with the students, being available and willing to assist students outside of class, giving well thought out and fair examinations, and seeking and encouraging criticism from colleagues.

3. Continue to up-date and up-grade the undergraduate programs so that the graduates are prepared to begin professional careers in engineering. Indications of how relevant the programs are to the needs of the profession include: the number of students enrolled; the ability of graduates to obtain professional employment; the extent to which employers seek graduates; the interest in professional societies shown by the students and the graduates, and their qualifications to become registered engineers.

4. Achieve and maintain full accreditation by ECPD of all engineering curricula. This goal includes accreditation of the graduate programs under ECPD's new designation of advanced professional programs.

5. Expand the engineering design and development, research, and public service programs for outside agencies to involve more faculty members and participation of 5-10 students per faculty member; with expenditures of about $4,000,000 annually, of which more than $800,000 are provided by private industry and $400,000 from other non-federal sources.

6. Increase the full-time graduate student enrollment in every degree-granting department so that there are at least 3-5 full-time graduate students per full-time faculty member.

7. Expand and improve relations with Tennessee industry, the various departments of state government, and the municipalities of Tennessee so that faculty are deeply involved in the solution of technical problems of Tennessee's industry and Tennessee's governmental agencies. Continuing efforts on small-industries research, engineering extension services for all Tennessee industries, and cooperative projects with the various city governments of Tennessee and the operating departments of Tennessee government would indicate that this goal has been achieved.

8. Initiate in each department significant cooperative projects with industrial associations which build on the specialized interests and talents of the faculty. These projects should serve to build up "peaks of excellence" in the departments and should afford unusually attractive opportunities for education of engineering students. There should exist at least one such cooperative project for each curriculum area of specialization offered in the various departments. The Industrial Consortium for Polymer Research and Education serves as an example of the cooperative projects with industrial associations to be developed.

SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE FUNDING PROJECT

AT

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT MARTIN

CHANCELLOR OF UTM: Dr. Larry T. McGehee

DIRECTOR OF THE PROJECT: Dr. Joseph L. DeVitis

DESCRIPTION OF THE UNIVERSITY:

The University of Tennessee at Martin is a state-supported university of approximately 5,000 students. The school is situated in Northwest Tennessee, about 125 miles northeast of Memphis and 150 miles northwest of Nashville. The University traces its origins back to 1900 but did not become a senior college until 1951. In 1967, the institution officially became The University of Tennessee at Martin.

The University of Tennessee at Martin is a primary campus of the University of Tennessee system. In broad reference, its role and function are similar to those of the University, including instruction, public service, and research. But in emphasis and focus, the Martin campus is primarily an instructional unit with significant responsibility and concern for undergraduate education.

The major goal of The University of Tennessee at Martin is to provide superior quality undergraduate instruction to a clientele composed chiefly of full-time residential students. To students who come from most of the counties in Tennessee as well as from many other states and a number of foreign countries, UTM offers programs of study leading to degrees in more than 65 specialized fields. These are offered through the schools of Agriculture, Business Administration, Education, Engineering and Engineering Technology, Home Economics, and Liberal Arts.

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS AND PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

GOALS	ASSOCIATED INDICATORS
(1) To develop basic skill competencies in English composition, reading, and general mathematics.	(1) Composition - Test of Standard Written English (ETS) Reading - Nelson-Denny Examination General Mathematics - UTM Mathematics Placement Examination
(2) To encourage students to evaluate their personal/social values and goals.	(2) Rokeach Value Survey
(3) To develop main-depth competence in a discipline.	(3) Departmental Examinations

SUMMARY OF PERFORMANCE FUNDING PROJECT

AT

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE AT NASHVILLE

CHANCELLOR OF THE UNIVERSITY: Dr. Charles E. Smith

DIRECTOR OF THE PROJECT: Doris G. Sullivan

DESCRIPTION OF THE UNIVERSITY:

The University of Tennessee at Nashville is a state supported university of approximately 4,700 headcount students in the college credit programs. Located in the capitol city of Nashville, population of approximately 486,000, the institution, which is now UTN, was established in 1947 as an extension center of the University's Knoxville Campus, offering evening classes for working adults. In order to meet community needs for a fully functional evening university, the Nashville Center was granted permission to develop into a four-year degree-granting institution upon completion of accreditation requirements of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Accreditation was granted in January 1971 when the institutional self-study, begun in 1969, was approved by the Association. In 1971, legislation was passed by the Tennessee General Assembly creating a new UT campus, The University of Tennessee at Nashville.

The University is located in downtown Nashville and has no dormitory nor athletic facilities. Approximately 70 percent of the students are employed 40 hours or more a week and the average student age is 27. A majority of the students (approximately 80 percent) live within 15 miles of the University and approximately 70 percent of the students have previously attended another college. At least 90 percent of the student population is enrolled for undergraduate work.

UTN's facilities are used during the daytime for a wide variety of public service and continuing education activities. Some 50,000 persons annually attend conferences, workshops, seminars, and government training classes at UTN.

UTN offers associate degree programs in nursing, fire science, and office administration. Baccalaureate degrees are offered in arts and sciences, business administration, education, engineering, and nursing. The campus has one graduate program, leading to the Master of Business Administration degree. Resident credit courses lead to the master's degree in engineering and in public administration. All degrees, except the associate degree program in nursing, are offered in the evening. In addition, UTN, in cooperation with the Tennessee Department of Corrections, offers through its "College Within the Walls" program, courses leading to the Associate of Arts degree for inmates at three state penal institutions.

INSTRUCTIONAL GOAL STATEMENTS AND ASSOCIATED PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR UTN

INSTITUTIONAL GOAL STATEMENTS FOR STUDENTS WHO WILL RECEIVE A BACCALAUREATE OR AN ASSOCIATE DEGREE FROM UTN	ASSOCIATED PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
1. Demonstrate a mastery of the skills of communication: reading, writing, and arithmetic.	ACT College Outcome Measures Project
2. Express a sense of self-worth and self-confidence.	Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire
3. Demonstrate ability to acquire knowledge and to apply it.	ACT Colllege Outcome Measures Project
4. Demonstrate analytical and problem-solving skills.	ACT College Outcome Measures Project
5. Demonstrate an awareness of their own values and the values of others.	ACT College Outcome Measures Project
6. Express the ability to cooperate and work with others.	Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire
7. Demonstrate a basic background in the humanities.	ETS Undergraduate Program Area Tests
8. Demonstrate a basic background in the social sciences.	ETS undergraduate Program Area Tests
9. Demonstrate a basic background in the natural sciences.	ETS Undergraduate Program Area Tests
10. Express an awareness of and concern for contemporary events, issues, and problems.	ETS Undergraduate Program Area Tests
11. See their college experience as satisfactory.	Questionnaire and follow-up study
12. Express a desire for or commitment to life-long learning.	Questionnaire and follow-up study
13. Demonstrate an indepth knowledge in their chosen area of concentration.	ETS Undergraduate Field Tests and Students' Performance on Professional and Graduate Admissions Exams

NON-DEGREE SEEKING STUDENT POPULATION	INSTITUTIONAL GOAL STATEMENTS FOR NON-DEGREE SEEKING STUDENT POPULATION	ASSOCIATED PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
1. Career-oriented--Improve skills for promotion and/or raise in salary in the field in which the student is currently employed.	Aid the student in improving his/her skills so that he/she may be able to be promoted and/or receive an increase in salary in the field in which the student is currently employed.	Follow-up questionnaire in which student is asked whether courses taken at UTN were beneficial in obtaining a raise or a promotion.
2. Career-oriented--Develop new skills in order to obtain a position in a different field than the one in which the student is currently employed.	Aid the student in developing his/her skills so that he/she may be able to obtain a job in a different field than the one in which the student is currently employed.	Follow-up questionnaire in which student is asked whether courses taken at UTN were beneficial in obtaining a position in another field.
3. Career-oriented--Develop new skills in order to enter job market.	Provide counseling to aid the student in choosing a career.	Percent of students obtaining career counseling.
	Aid the student in developing skills which will enable the student to successfully enter the job market.	Follow-up questionnaire.
4. Broadening of knowledge and cultural enrichment.	Provide courses which students may take for cultural enrichment and an increase in knowledge about the subject.	Follow-up questionnaire
5. Social reasons.	Provide an atmosphere in which adult students may meet and discuss common areas of interest.	Questionnaire
6. Unsure as to degree area and are simply taking some courses which they hope will help them make a decision.	Provide students with the opportunity to "try out" different areas when they are unsure as to their degree choice.	Questionnaire

NON-DEGREE SEEKING STUDENT POPULATION	INSTITUTIONAL GOAL STATEMENTS FOR NON-DEGREE SEEKING STUDENT POPULATION	ASSOCIATED PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
7. Preparation for professional examinations.	Provide courses which will increase a student's knowledge of a particular subject and at the same time increase his/her ability to pass a professional examination.	Entry and exit examinations. Follow-up study.
8. Prerequisites for MBA	Provide courses which will increase a student's knowledge of a particular subject and at the same time increase his/her ability to be successful in the MBA program.	Entry and exit examinations. Follow-up study.
9. Transient students.	To provide courses at a time or place which is more convenient for them or less expensive than the cost of the course offered by the institution from which they intend to graduate.	Questionnaire.

GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL GOALS	ASSOCIATED PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
To provide an educational opportunity for the adult who works during the daytime hours in the Middle Tennessee area.	Percent of students who are working adults.
To provide an educational opportunity through the external degree program for the adult who has a difficult time attending classes on a campus on a regular basis.	Percent of students working toward external degree who could not have attended classes on a regular basis.
To provide credit for life experiences which are applicable toward a degree through the use of CLEP and proficiency examinations	Number of students taking CLEP and proficiency examinations per year.
To provide noncredit activities which will increase the chance of success of the student who finds that he/she must do some developmental work in order to be able to do satisfactory work in an undergraduate degree-granting program.	Number of students enrolled in developmental courses. Entry and exit examinations.
To provide an educational opportunity to the inmates in three penal institutions in the state.	Number of students enrolled in the Associate of Arts degree program.
To develop and sponsor or cosponsor with experts in the community, institutes, conferences, seminars, workshops, and symposiums which will be of benefit to the adult population in Tennessee.	Number of institutes, conferences, seminars, workshops, and symposiums offered during a year. Summary of evaluations administered at the end of all institutes, conferences, seminars, workshops and symposiums in which the participants have an opportunity to state the benefit of the program(s). Follow-up questionnaire to the employers of the participants when applicable.
To create an institution recognized for its public service commitment to the community.	Random sampling of the community to determine its level of awareness of UTN's public service activities.

GENERAL INSTITUTIONAL GOALS	ASSOCIATED PERFORMANCE INDICATOR
8. To include local citizens in the short- and long-range planning of the institution's public service activities.	Statements from the Dean of Public Service and the local citizens involved as to how and to what extent they were involved in the planning of UTN's public service activities.
9. To work with the center for Government Training in offering courses of study which will increase the efficiency and productivity of government employees.	Follow-up study of government employees who have attended classes at UTN and their supervisors.
10. To provide continuing education units for courses of study which qualify for the units and for which there is a demand in the community.	Number of continuing education units awarded during the year.
11. To provide an atmosphere which will encourage adults who have had an unsuccessful academic college experience in a typical college setting to attend UTN and to aid them in being academically successful.	Questionnaire Report on transfer students' cumulative grade point average before and after attending UTN. Retention study.
12. To offer review programs for professional examinations which will be of benefit to the participants.	Number and type of review programs offered. Follow-up study on the participants.

Evaluation Network Newsletter #12, Summer 1979

Housing

Report of the Task Force on Improving the Operation of Federally Insured or Financed Housing Operations, Volumes I, II and III, National Center for Housing Management, Washington: October 1972.

Housing in the Seventies: Chapter 4, Department of Housing and Urban Development, National Housing Policy Review, Washington: 1976.

How Housing Allowances Work, Integrated Funding from the Experimental Housing Allowance Program, the Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.: February 1978.

Lower Income Housing Assistance Program (Section 8), Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research, November 1978.

Section 236 Rented Housing—An Evaluation with Lessons for the Future, General Accounting Office. PAD-78-13, Washington: 1978.

Community Development

The Model Cities Program, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Community Development and Evaluation, Washington (AUD-CDED-MC-37). No date.

Block Grants for Community Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1977.

Decentralizing Community Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1978.

Community Development Block Grant Evaluation Design, University of Pennsylvania, 1979 (unpublished document).

Evaluation in Higher Education: Departmental and Program Review

Larry A. Braskamp
Measurement and Research Division
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Program evaluation in higher education is an inclusive term which includes several types or forms: institutional research, reputational ratings, voluntary accreditation, departmental and intrainstitutional program evaluation and review, evaluation of curricular design, and state-level program reviews. These six types of evaluation encompass the vast range of purposes of evaluation, the intended uses and audiences of the evaluative information, types of information collected, and methodologies used in collecting the data. In this article, departmental and program reviews and evaluations within an institution will be highlighted. It is the most recent systematic form of evaluation (perhaps the most akin to the common definition of evaluation) and represents a fairly recent response by those in higher education to four interrelated pressures: the need for sound institutional management; the continual desire for self improvement; the need to assess quality; and the obligation to respond to demands by those external to the university for accountability.

The last ten years have seen a considerable increase in program or department reviews. In a survey of 134 colleges and universities with graduate programs, Clark (1977) notes that over one third have some form of systematic departmental review. There are several reasons why program reviews have become popular. The highly quantitative managerial and fiscal data provided by centralized offices of institutional research have not been sufficient to satisfy the needs of campus administrators and faculty for information about quality. Moreover, local campus officials could see that if they did not develop some monitoring and quality control processes, state agencies and legislative staffs would institute an accountability system. Thus departmental program evaluations were intended for internal use, with the faculty and campus administrators serving as the primary audiences. Although accountability was local, the institutions used this process to demonstrate their responsibility to the external constituencies.

The most common stated purpose of the departmental review is to serve administrators in conjunction with the faculty in making institutional wide budgetary decisions and planning. However, there has been also a strong undercurrent to use the evaluation as a vehicle for self improvement (the summative-formative distinction). In practice, reviews are used for both functions. In the early stages of a program review, the faculty are especially attentive to the first purpose; i.e., how will an evaluation be used by the central administration? The governance process in most educational institutions has been (and still is) one of accommodation, compromise, and negotiation, rather than of authority figures exercising financial and managerial power. While there has been a trend toward a centralization of planning and information processing, facilitated by the emergence of computerized and centralized data bases, the decision making at an institution still is predominantly diffuse, decentralized, and vested within the academic community. This tension between centralization and decentralization surfaces when a new administrative process is introduced, since infomration from an evaluation is viewed as a source of power in the policy making process.

Most program reviews do not follow closely some model of conceptualization of evaluation. Goal based evaluations are more apt to be found in colleges where competency based instructional programs in vocational and technical education are more common. In general, most reviews rely heavily on professional judgments. Values and criteria for judging worth are implicit. "To trust diligent observation and considered judgment," a key idea in Stake's responsive evaluation approach, is often an implicit characteristic of departmental evaluations. Often the process begins with a departmental or unit self-study in which the faculty get an opportunity to present their case. Considerable descriptive data (e.g., faculty demographic data like research productivity, service assignments, teaching loads, student characteristics, fiscal information, and student credit hours produced) are collected or obtained from central information systems. Discussions by the faculty about departmental

goals, issues, concerns, and self assessments of quality are also a key part of the self study. A second phase may involve a group of professionals (e.g., faculty members in similar disciplines from other universities, faculty at the same institution, or representatives from citizen groups, professional associations, and state legislatures) conductive intensive on-site visits to interview departmental faculty and local administrators. On some campuses an appointed task force has been used to conduct an indepth study to replace the self evaluation, but the time demands have been too great to make this approach widely used. A centralized committee, consisting of appointed and/or elected faculty members and selected administrators often is involved throughout the evaluation. It may monitor the entire process, provide assistance in data collection, and spend considerable time in discussions about the relative merits and problem areas of the units. The evaluations are often not explicitly comparative; i.e., the uniqueness of each department is espoused and information about similar departments at other universities is often too costly to collect. However, if the major impetus for initiating an evaluation is for reallocation purposes, the final judgments are of necessity comparative. The committee is usually advisory to a vice chancellor or president of the institution and makes reports to two primary audiences—the departmental faculty and the central administration.

One of the major concerns has been the confidentiality and public access to raw data, self evaluations, judgments of designated peers and administrators, and the openness of committee meetings. There has been the inevitable tension between the right to know and the protection of the privacy and confidentiality of those evaluating as well as those being evaluated. Faculty as much as any one value their privacy and autonomy. Few in higher education can clearly separate program and personnel evaluation.

What is the future of formal departmental and program review processes? They should continue to be useful. This approach incorporates value judgments by faculty, input that reflects the quality of an institution. By and large, universities and colleges are self correcting institutions; they cannot completely succumb to all environmental and external pressure if they will serve American society as they have in the past. (See George and Braskamp, 1977). This approach has been highly interactive and has facilitated two-way open communication networks between faculty and administrators and in some cases with state government officials. Based on research on knowledge and information utilization, interpersonal contacts and relationships are important for establishing trust between the parties and an appreciation of each other's position. This arrangement may be one of the most effective ways to demonstrate accountability and to establish the credibility of the evaluation efforts. Given the tradition of faculty involvement in the governance of an institution and the high likelihood for internal reallocations in the next decade, a process that involves extensive participation in data gathering, data interpretation, and data dissemination seems to be as good an alternative as any.

The challenges for those in higher education evaluation will center on three issues. The first is to develop ways to systematically collect better judgment and quality data. The considerable data collected to date have been primarily descriptive, quantitative, and focused on input measures. We have little information on how an institution is doing as a place to learn, explore, and develop people. Secondly, the academic community will need to find ways to open up the discussion of solutions which will adversely affect some of the faculty. The sensitivity to zero sum budgeting and retrenchment are important. At institutions which aspire to be high quality research institutions, there exists an inherent conflict between quality as viewed by the university academic community and quality as viewed by the practitioners in the field and the general public. It revolves around the priority given to the faculty research productivity and the practical mission of the department. This is most acute in the professional schools such as education, library, social work, and medicine (see Atkin, 1978). But as fewer and fewer graduates of advanced programs will be in similar positions like their mentors, this tension about the mission of the school becomes a pivotal point in assessing quality.

The final challenge is to more adequately integrate evaluative judgmental data and budgetary fiscal data. While benefit analyses practiced in business will not likely be very useful in higher education (Millett, 1975), an information system that incorporates both quality and managerial information will be essential. Today we have two largely separate groups—the faculty dominated program review committees concerned with quality and the institutional researchers providing budgetary and managerial data to central administrators and external agencies. The challenge is for administrators to establish an evaluation system that simultaneously incorporates the realities of fiscal management and protects the uniqueness of the institution so that quality and effectiveness are more than cost figures related to production.

References

Atkin, J. M. Institutional self-evaluation versus national professional accreditation or back to the normal school? **Educational Researcher** 1978, 7, 307.

Clark, M. J. Program review practices of university departments. The Graduate Record Examinations Board Research Report GREB no. 75-5aR, Educational Testing Service, July, 1977.

Dressel, P. L. **Handbook of Academic Evaluation**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

George, M. D. and Braskamp, L. A. Universities, accountability, and the uncertainty principle. **Educational Record**, 1978, 59, 345-366.

Millett, J. D. Higher education management versus business management. **Educational Record**, Fall, 1975, 56, 221-225.